



HHS Case No. 2017-01242-FOIA-OS

***Campaign for Accountability v. HHS*, Civil No. 18-0464 (D.D.C.)**

January 16, 2019

Daniel Stevens
Legal Counsel
Campaign for Accountability
611 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., #337
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Mr. Stevens:

This letter is the seventh interim response to your September 27, 2017, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. Specifically, you requested the following records:

1. All communications, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational materials, draft legislation, talking points, or other documents received by representatives of HHS from, sent by representatives of HHS to, or exchanged between representatives of HHS and representatives of the Susan B. Anthony List, Concerned Women for America, the Heritage Foundation, and/or the Center for Family and Human Rights ("C-Fam") regarding the January 23 presidential memorandum reinstating the Mexico City Policy,¹ or the Department of State's May 15 "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" plan implementing the policy.
2. All calendar entries reflecting meetings between representatives of HHS and representatives of the Susan B. Anthony List, Concerned Women for America, the Heritage Foundation, and/or C-Fam regarding the January 23 presidential memorandum reinstating the Mexico City Policy, or the Department of State's May 15 "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" plan implementing the policy.
3. All communications, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational materials, draft legislation, talking points, or other documents received by representatives of HHS from, sent by representatives of HHS to, or exchanged between representatives of HHS Development, and/or the Trump White House regarding the January 23 presidential memorandum reinstating the Mexico City Policy, or the Department of State's May 15 "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" plan implementing the policy.
4. All calendar entries reflecting meetings between representatives of HHS and representatives of the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and/or the Trump White House regarding the January 23 presidential memorandum reinstating the Mexico City Policy, or the Department of State's May 15 "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" plan implementing the policy. and representatives of the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and/or the Trump White House regarding the January 23 presidential memorandum reinstating the Mexico City Policy, or the Department of State's May 15 "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" plan implementing the policy.

Page 2 of 2

HHS Case No. 2017-01242-FOIA-OS

***Campaign for Accountability v. HHS*, Civil No. 18-0464 (D.D.C.)**

For this seventh interim response, the Department has processed 501 pages of potentially responsive records captured in the agency's search. Of these 501 pages, I am releasing 5 pages in their entirety, and I am further releasing 15 pages in part, with portions redacted, pursuant to Exemptions 5 and 6 of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. §552 (b)(5), (b)(6)). Additionally, I am withholding 267 pages in their entirety pursuant to Exemption 5 (5 U.S.C. §552 (b)(5)). Also, I am referring nine (9) pages to the Department of State, and 125 pages to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for review and direct response to you. Furthermore, I have determined that 80 pages are either duplicative of records previously referred to other agencies for direct response to you, or are not responsive to your request.

FOIA exemption (b)(5) protects inter-agency or intra-agency memoranda or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. This exemption protects documents that would be covered by any privilege an agency could assert in a civil proceeding. These privileges include, among others, the deliberative process privilege, the attorney-client privilege, and the attorney work-product privilege

FOIA exemption (b)(6) permits a Federal agency to withhold information and records about individuals in "personnel and medical files and similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." The definition of "similar files" has historically been broadly interpreted to include a wide variety of files, and the United States Supreme Court has held that Congress intended the term "similar files" to be interpreted broadly, rather than narrowly. I have analyzed these records and find they meet the threshold requirement of this exemption. Additionally, I have reviewed and weighed the public interest in disclosure of this information against the privacy interest in nondisclosure, and found that the privacy interest outweighs the public's interest in disclosure.

We will continue to review the remaining records as efficiently and expeditiously as possible, consistent with our available resources. Should you have questions or concerns regarding the Department's response and/or the processing of your request, any such issues should be communicated to your legal counsel and Department of Justice Attorney representing the Department in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. S. Marquis", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael S. Marquis
Director
Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts Division